

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION N | Э. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/839,803 04/20/2001 | | 04/20/2001 | Adrian Lungu | IM1303 US NA | 2560 | |
| 23906 | 7590 | 06/26/2006 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| 2.20. | 0111 | NEMOURS AND C ECORDS CENTER | WALKE, A | WALKE, AMANDA C | | |
| BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | ICASTER | _ | 1752 | | | |
| WILMINGTON, DE 19805 | | | | DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 09/839,803 | LUNGU, ADRIAN | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Amanda C. Walke | 1752 | |

| Auvisory Action | 09/839,803 EUNGO, ADRIAN | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Amanda C. Walke | 1752 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 08 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | LLOWANCE. | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 Cl | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | g date of the final rejection | on. | | | |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | 06.07(f). | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | pliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be | filed within two month | s of the date of | | | |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS 2 | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or | • | ducing or simplifying | the issues for | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | ected claims. | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | mpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | • | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). | • | • | • | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | ll be entered and an e | explanation of | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome all rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fai | ils to provide a | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attach | ned. | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. | t does NOT place the application in | n condition for allowar | nce because: | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other: | | · · · | | | | |
| | | Amanda C Walke Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1752 | ua . | | | |
| | | Art Unit: 1752 | 6/23/06 | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has again argued that the Araki et al reference teaches that the material for use in a relief plate, but fails to exemplify its use for relief plates in the examples. As discussed in the final office rejection, the examiner is not persuaded by this argument, because the reference does suggest the material's use for a relief plate, and the fact that it is not exemplified does not teach away from using the material for a relief plate. Also, with respect to the amount of the onium salt compound in relation to the dye, given the amounts of the compound taught to be employed in the material, thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have been reasonably motivated to employ the compounds in any amounts within their claimed ranges, and obtain a material wherein the onium salt compound is employed in a greater amount than the dye..